arXiv:1612.08028v1 [math.NT] 23 Dec 2016

SQUARE-FREE VALUES OF DECOMPOSABLE FORMS

STANLEY YAO XIAO

Abstract. In this paper we prove that decomposable forms, or homogeneous polynomials $F(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ with integer coefficients which split completely into linear factors over $\mathbb{C}$, take on infinitely many square-free values subject to simple necessary conditions and $\deg f \leq 2n + 2$ for all irreducible factors f of F. This work generalizes a theorem of Greaves.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the density of integer tuples $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ satisfying $|x_i| \leq B$ and for which $F(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ is square-free, where F is an n-ary *decomposable form* of degree $d > n$. Before stating our result, we shall give a brief summary of work done on square-free values of polynomials to date.

For a polynomial $g(x)$ with integer coefficients, define the counting function

$$N_g(B) = \#\{x \in \mathbb{Z} : |x| \leq B, f(x) \text{ is square-free}\}.$$

Estermann [10] showed that when $g(x) = x^2 + 1$, there exists a positive number c_g such that the asymptotic formula

$$N_g(B) = c_g B + O(B^{2/3} \log B) \tag{1.1}$$

holds. We will say that a polynomial g has *no fixed square divisor* if for all primes p there exists $n_p \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $p^2 \nmid g(n_p)$. Ricci [34] generalized Estermann's work and showed that for any irreducible quadratic polynomial with no fixed square divisor, there exists a positive number c_g such that (1.1) holds. Erdős showed that

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} N_g(B) = \infty$$

in [8] for cubic polynomials with no fixed square divisor. Hooley [24] refined the work of Estermann, Ricci, and Erdős and showed that for all cubic polynomials g with no fixed square divisor, there exists a positive number c_g such that (1.1) holds with a worse error term. Helfgott further refined Hooley's work in [22] by showing that an analogous asymptotic formula to (1.1) holds when we replace integer inputs with prime inputs. To date, it is not known whether (1.1) holds unconditionally for any polynomial g with no fixed square divisor with $\deg g \geq 4$.

Conditioned upon the *abc*-conjecture, Granville and Poonen proved respectively in [14] and [32] that polynomials in a single variable and polynomials in multiple variables take on infinitely many square-free values. Note that Poonen's result does not

Date: December 26, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11B05.

Key words and phrases. Power-free values, polynomials, number theory.

allow one to deduce an analogous asymptotic formula to (1.1). Bhargava, Shankar, and Wang [3] recently announced an asymptotic formula for square-free values of *discriminant polynomials*, which does not use the *abc*-conjecture.

A natural generalization from the case of single-variable polynomials is to binary forms. Greaves made a breakthrough in [15] on the problem of square-free values of binary forms that for a suitable binary form $F(x, y)$ with integer coefficients with no fixed square divisor. He showed that the density of integer pairs (x, y) such that $F(x, y)$ is square-free is exactly as expected provided that $d' \leq 6$, where d' is the largest degree of an irreducible factor of F. One observes that the requirement $d' \leq 6$ can be compared to $d \leq 3$ in the single variable case. Hooley, in [25] and [26], extended Greaves's results to the case when F is a polynomial in two variables which splits into linear factors over $\mathbb{C}$.

Schmidt, in [36], introduced an invariant which he called the discriminant for (incomplete) *norm forms* which we define below. Write

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} L_j(\mathbf{x}),$$

where the L_j's are conjugates of the linear form

$$L_1(\mathbf{x}) = \omega_1 x_1 + \omega_2 x_2 + \cdots + \omega_n x_n$$

with algebraic integer coefficients in a number field K. We then put

$$\Delta(F) = \prod_{\{i_1, \cdots, i_n\} \subset \{1, \cdots, d\}} |\det(L_{i_1}, \cdots, L_{i_n})|, \tag{1.2}$$

where the determinant of n linear forms in $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ refers to the determinant of its coefficients. It is easy to check that $\Delta(F)$ is invariant under any action of the Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$, and since each term that appears in the product is an algebraic integer, it follows that $\Delta(F)$ is a rational integer. We say that F has *bad reduction* at a prime p if F has a repeated linear factor over $\mathbb{F}_p$. One notes that bad reduction can only occur if $p|\Delta(F)$. Therefore, if $\Delta(F)$ is non-zero, then bad reduction can only occur for finitely many primes.

In this paper, we extend Greaves's work in [15] and Hooley's work in [25] and [26] by generalizing Greaves's geometry of numbers method for n-ary *decomposable forms* and adapting Hooley's sieve arguments. Incomplete norm forms and decomposable forms are defined by Schmidt in [36] and Evertse in [11], respectively.

For an integer k and an integer m, we say that m is k-free if for all primes p dividing m, we have $p^k \nmid m$. For a set S, we write $\#S$ for the cardinality of S. Let us write, for an n-ary form F with integer coefficients,

$$\rho_F(m) = \#\{(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^n : F(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \equiv 0 \pmod{m}\} \tag{1.3}$$

and for a positive number B and an integer $k \geq 2$,

$$N_{F,k}(B) = \#\{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |x_i| \leq B, F(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \text{ is } k\text{-free}\}. \tag{1.4}$$

We will prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Write* $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ *and let*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = L_1(\mathbf{x}) \cdots L_r(\mathbf{x})$$

be a decomposable *form with non-zero discriminant* $\Delta(F)$ *as given in (1.2), where* $L_1, \cdots, L_r$ *are linear forms with algebraic integral coefficients in some finite extension* $K/\mathbb{Q}$*. Let* d *be the maximal degree of a* $\mathbb{Q}$*-irreducible factor of* F*. Let* $k \geq 2$ *be an integer with the property that for all primes* p*, there exists a vector* $\mathbf{x}^{(p)} = \left(x_1^{(p)}, \cdots, x_n^{(p)}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ *such that* $p^k \nmid F\left(\mathbf{x}^{(p)}\right)$*. Then the asymptotic relation*

$$N_{F,k}(B) \sim B^n \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{\rho_F(p^k)}{p^{nk}}\right)$$

holds whenever

$$k \geq \frac{d-2}{n}. \tag{1.5}$$

In particular, if $k = 2$, then F takes on infinitely many square-free values as long as $d \leq 2n + 2$. This recovers the theorem of Greaves in [15].

The outline of our paper is as follows. In Section 2 we will use an elementary sieve argument to partition the relevant main terms and error terms to be estimated in order to prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 3, we will generalize Greaves's geometry of numbers argument in [15] to the case of decomposable forms over $\mathbb{Z}$. In Sections 4 and 5, we adapt the Ekedahl Sieve as described in [2] and [7] and the Selberg sieve, as expressed by Hooley in [25], to establish an estimate for the remaining error terms relevant to condition (1.5) of Theorem 1.1.

2. Preliminaries

We will show that $N_{F,k}(B)$ (recall (1.4)) satisfies an inequality of the form

$$N_1(B) - N_2(B) - N_3(B) \leq N_{F,k}(B) \leq N_1(B). \tag{2.1}$$

Our goal will be to demonstrate that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, that

$$N_1(B) = B^n \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{\rho_F(p^k)}{p^{nk}}\right) + O_\varepsilon\left(B^{n-\varepsilon}\right),$$

and for some $\delta_n > 0$, that

$$N_2(B) = O\left(B^n\left(\xi_1^{-1} + (\log B)^{-\delta_n}\right)\right)$$

and that

$$N_3(B) = o(B).$$

We will define these quantities in terms of a real parameter B and a positive number ξ_1. Put

$$\xi_2 = B^n (\log B)^{2/3}. \tag{2.2}$$

Now define

$$N_1(B) = \#\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |x_i| \leq B, \text{if } p^k | F(\mathbf{x}), \text{then } p > \xi_1\}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$N_2(B) = \#\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |x_i| \leq B, \text{there exists } p \in (\xi_1, \xi_2] \text{ s.t. } p^2 | F(\mathbf{x}), \text{and if } p^k | F(\mathbf{x}), \text{then } p > \xi_1\}, \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$N_3(B) = \#\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |x_i| \leq B, \text{there exists } p > \xi_2 \text{ s.t. } p^k | F(\mathbf{x}), \text{and if } p^k | F(\mathbf{x}), \text{then } p > \xi_1\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Before we proceed with estimating $N_1(B)$, let us establish some facts about the function ρ_F as defined in (1.3). For a positive integer m and a real number α, let us write

$$\sigma_\alpha(m) = \sum_{s|m} s^\alpha.$$

We will establish the following lemma:

Lemma 2.1. *Let ρ_F be defined as in* (1.3)*. Then ρ_F is multiplicative and for all primes p we have*

$$\rho_F(p^k) = O_{d,n}\left(p^{k(n-1)} + p^{n(k-1)}\right).$$

If m is a square-free integer, then

$$\rho_F(m) = O(m^{n-1}\sigma_{-1/4}(m)).$$

Proof. The fact that ρ_F is multiplicative follows from the Chinese Remainder Theorem. For the upper bound, let us first suppose that there exists an index, say $i = 1$, such that $p \nmid x_1$. Then there are at most p^k many choices for $x_2, \cdots, x_n$. Having fixed these, there are then at most d choices for x_1. Hence, there are at most $ndp^{(n-1)k}$ choices for $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$. Otherwise, suppose that $p|x_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Write $x_i = px_i'$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then there are at most p^{k-1} choices for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$, whence there are $p^{n(k-1)}$ choices altogether. Combining these, we obtain the claimed upper bound.

For the second part, we are dealing with an algebraic hypersurface defined over finite fields $\mathbb{F}_p$, so by the theorem of Lang-Weil in [28], we have

$$\rho_F(p) = p^{n-1} + O_F(p^{n-3/2}).$$

Multiplicativity of ρ_F then yields

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_F(m) &= \prod_{p|m}\left(p^{n-1} + O_F(p^{n-3/2})\right) \\ &= m^{n-1}\prod_{p|m}\left(1 + O_F(p^{-1/2})\right) \\ &= O_F(m^{n-1}\sigma_{-1/4}(m)).\end{aligned}$$

□

We give an estimate for $M_1(B)$. Define, for a positive integer b, the quantity

$$N(b, B) = \#\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap [-B, B]^n : b^k | F(\mathbf{x})\}.$$

Then from the familiar property of the Mobius function μ, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_1(B) &= \sum_{\substack{b\in\mathbb{N}\\ p|b\Rightarrow p\le\xi_1}} \mu(b)N(b,B) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{b\in\mathbb{N}\\ p|b\Rightarrow p\le\xi_1}} \mu(b)\rho_F(b^k)\left(\frac{B^n}{b^{nk}}+O\left(\frac{B^{n-1}}{b^{(n-1)k}}+1\right)\right) \\ &= B^n\prod_{p\le\xi_1}\left(1-\frac{\rho_F(p^k)}{p^{nk}}\right)+O\left(\sum_{\substack{b\in\mathbb{N}\\ p|b\Rightarrow p\le\xi_1}}\rho_F(b^k)\left(\frac{B^{n-1}}{b^{(n-1)k}}+1\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

By the theorem of Rosser and Schoenfeld [35], it follows that

$$\prod_{p\le\xi_1} p \le e^{2\xi_1}$$

for all positive ξ_1. Hence, we obtain via Lemma 2.1 that

$$N_1(B) = B^n\prod_{p\le\xi_1}\left(1-\frac{\rho_F(p^k)}{p^{nk}}\right)+O\left(\sum_{b\le e^{2\xi_1}} B^{n-1+\varepsilon}+b^{n(k-1)+\varepsilon}+b^{k(n-1)+\varepsilon}\right).$$

We then see that

$$N_1(B) = B^n\prod_{p}\left(1-\frac{\rho_F(p^k)}{p^{nk}}\right)+O_{\xi_1,\varepsilon}\left(B^{n-1+\varepsilon}\right).$$

In the next section we will see that we can obtain good estimates for $N_2(B)$ even when ξ_2 is as large as $B^n(\log B)^{2/3}$. Let

$$F(x_1,\cdots,x_n) = \mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x})\cdots\mathcal{F}_r(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $d=\max_{1\le j\le r}\deg\mathcal{F}_j$. Let us write

$$\begin{aligned} N_2^{(j)}(B) = \#\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n : |x_i|\le B, &\text{there exists } p\in(\xi_1,\xi_2] \text{ s.t. } p^k|\mathcal{F}_j(\mathbf{x}), \text{ and} \\ &\text{if } p^k|\mathcal{F}_j(\mathbf{x}), \text{then } p>\xi_1\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} N_3^{(j)}(B) = \#\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n : |x_i|\le B, &\text{there exists } p>\xi_2 \text{ s.t. } p^k|\mathcal{F}_j(\mathbf{x}), \text{ and} \\ &\text{if } p^k|\mathcal{F}_j(\mathbf{x}), \text{then } p>\xi_1\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbf{x}$ is counted by $N_2(B)$ (respectively $N_3(B)$) but not by $N_2^{(j)}(B)$ (respectively $N_3^{(j)}(B)$) for $j=1,\cdots,r$, then there must exist $j_1<j_2$ and a positive integer $k'<k$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}_{j_1}(\mathbf{x})\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{k'}} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_{j_2}(\mathbf{x})\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{k-k'}}.$$

However, this can only happen if $p|\Delta(F)$, so this situation can be avoided if B is chosen sufficiently large. Hence, we have

$$N_2(B)\le\sum_{j=1}^{r} N_2^{(j)}(B)$$

and

$$N_3(B) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r} N_3^{(j)}(B).$$

It therefore suffices to deal with the case when F is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $d = \deg F$.

3. Geometry of Numbers

In this section we shall give an estimate for $N_2(B)$. To do so, we show that for each modulus m we can reduce the problem to counting integer points of bounded height in a finite number $\mathcal{N}_F$ of lattices, the important feature being that $\mathcal{N}_F$ is dependent only on F.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$ be an incomplete norm form of degree $d > n$. Let $p \nmid \Delta(F)$ be a prime, and let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a solution to the congruence*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}.$$

Then $\mathbf{a}$ lies on a finite number $\mathcal{N}_F$ of lattices $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$. Moreover, for each such lattice Λ, we have $\det \Lambda \geq p^2$.

Proof. By the same argument as that in Section 5 of [26], we can factor F into

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = F^*(\mathbf{x}) \prod_{i=1}^{\tau(p)} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{x}) = v_1^{(i)} x_1 + v_2^{(i)} x_2 + \cdots + v_n^{(i)} x_n$ are defined over $\mathbb{Z}_p$, while $F^*(\mathbf{x})$ is a form defined over $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Suppose that $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a solution to the congruence

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}.$$

Then $\mathbf{a}$ is of one of the following types:

(a) There exists exactly one $i, 1 \leq i \leq \tau(p)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$, while $\mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{a}) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for $j \neq i$, and $F^*(\mathbf{a}) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

(b) There exist $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq \tau(p)$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_{i_1}(\mathbf{a}) \equiv \mathcal{L}_{i_2}(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

(c) $F^*(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

If $\mathbf{a}$ is of type (a), then $\mathbf{a}$ lies on the union of at most $\tau(p) \leq d$ lattices of determinant p^2. If $\mathbf{a}$ is of type (b), then there are two further sub-cases. Firstly, and more simply, there exist two indices $i_1 < i_2$ and an integer t such that

$$\mathcal{L}_{i_1}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv t\mathcal{L}_{i_2}(\mathbf{x}) \pmod{p}. \tag{3.1}$$

If (3.1) holds, then it follows that $\Delta(F) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, hence p divides the discriminant $\Delta(F)$ of F. Thus, there are only finitely many primes for which this could happen. Otherwise, $\mathbf{a}$ lies on the intersection of two distinct lattices Λ_1, Λ_2 of determinant p, defined by

$$\Lambda_1 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{a}_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\}$$

and

$$\Lambda_2 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{a}_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\},$$

where $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2$ are two distinct vectors modulo p. Now, let ϕ_1, ϕ_2 be homomorphisms from $\mathbb{Z}^n$ to $\mathbb{F}_p$ defined by

$$\phi_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x} \pmod{p}$$

and

$$\phi_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot \mathbf{x} \pmod{p}.$$

Then Λ_1, Λ_2 are the kernels of ϕ_1, ϕ_2 respectively. Now let ϕ be defined by $\phi : \mathbb{Z}^n \to (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^2, \phi(\mathbf{x}) = (\phi_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi_2(\mathbf{x}))$. The image of ϕ is the full set $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^2$ whenever $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2$ are distinct modulo p. Hence, $\mathbf{a}$ lies in a lattice of determinant at least p^2. Further, there are at most $\tau(p)^2 \leq d^2$ such lattices. Finally, if $\mathbf{a}$ is of type (c), then by taking a Galois action over an appropriate field extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$, we see that $\mathbf{a}$ is the simultaneous solution of the congruence $L(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for two linear forms, both factors of F^*, and so the same argument shows that $\mathbf{a}$ lies in one of at most d^2 lattices of determinant at least p^2. □

Now we generalize Lemma 1 in [15] (see also [18]) for norm forms in $n \geq 2$ variables. Indeed, we will prove the following:

Lemma 3.2. *Let m be a positive integer and le $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^n$. Write $\boldsymbol{\upsilon} = (\upsilon_1, \upsilon_2, \cdots, \upsilon_n)$ with $\gcd(\upsilon_1, m) = 1$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\upsilon}; m)$ for the minimum positive value of $H(\mathbf{x}) = \max\{|x_1|, \cdots, |x_n|\}$ satisfying*

$$x_1 \equiv -\upsilon_1^{-1}\upsilon_2 x_2 - \cdots - \upsilon_1^{-1}\upsilon_n x_n \pmod{m}. \tag{3.2}$$

Then the number

$$N_{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}(B; m) = \#\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{\upsilon} \equiv 0 \pmod{m}, |x_i| \leq B, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

satisfies

$$N_{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}(B; m) \ll_n \frac{B^n}{m} + O\left(\frac{B^{n-1}}{\mathcal{M}^{n-1}} + 1\right).$$

Proof. We observe that the set of vectors $\mathbf{x}$ in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying (3.2) forms a lattice of full rank in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ of determinant m. Let us denote this lattice by $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(m)$. Then there exists a vector in $\mathcal{L}$, say $\mathbf{x}_1 = \left(x_1^{(1)}, \cdots, x_n^{(1)}\right)$ which is the shortest with respect to sup norm. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $|x_1^{(0)}| = \mathcal{M}$. Observe that $\mathcal{M} \leq m^{1/n}$. To see this, let $l = l(m)$ denote the smallest positive integer such that $(l+1)^n > m$. Then there exist two distinct vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2$ such that the coordinates of both vectors are at most $l/2$ in absolute value and

$$\mathbf{a}_1 \equiv \mathbf{a}_2 \pmod{m},$$

whence their difference $\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$ and $H(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2) \leq m^{1/n}$.

By Lemma 4.3 in [4], there exist vectors $\mathbf{x}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{L}$ such that

$$m \leq \prod_{j=1}^{n} H(\mathbf{x}_j) \ll_n m,$$

and for all vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{L}$, if we write

$$\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j \mathbf{x}_j,$$

we have

$$|\lambda_j| \ll_n \frac{H(\mathbf{x})}{H(\mathbf{x}_j)}.$$

In particular, for a vector $\mathbf{x}$ counted by $N_{\boldsymbol{v}}(B; m)$, we have

$$|\lambda_j| \ll_n \frac{B}{H(\mathbf{x}_j)}.$$

By observing that $H(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq \mathcal{M}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, n$, we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\boldsymbol{v}}(B; m) &\ll_n \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 + \frac{B}{H(\mathbf{x}_j)}\right) \\ &\ll_n \frac{B^n}{m} + \frac{B^{n-1}}{\mathcal{M}^{n-1}} + \cdots + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain the consequence of the lemma. □

We now estimate $N_2(B)$ via the following lemma:

Lemma 3.3. *The error term $N_2(B)$ satisfies*

$$N_2(B) = O_n\left(B^n\left(\xi_1^{-1} + (\log B)^{-1/3n}\right)\right).$$

Proof. Observe that

$$N_2(B) \ll_n \sum_{\xi_1 < p \leq B^n (\log B)^{2/3}} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \tau(p)} N_{\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}}(B; p^2).$$

By Lemma 3.2, it follows that

$$N_2(B) \ll_n \sum_{\xi_1 < p \leq B^n (\log B)^{2/3}} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \tau(p)} \left(\frac{B^n}{p^2} + \frac{B^{n-1}}{(\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}; p^2))^{n-1}}\right).$$

We first consider examine the term

$$\sum_{\xi_1 < p \leq \xi_2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \tau(p)} \frac{B^n}{p^2}. \tag{3.3}$$

The sum

$$\sum_{p > \xi_1} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \tau(p)} \frac{1}{p^2}$$

converges and is bounded by $O\left(\xi_1^{-1}\right)$. Now we look at the sum

$$\sum_{\xi_1 < p \leq \xi_2} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \tau(p)} \frac{B^{n-1}}{(\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}; p^2))^{n-1}}.$$

We break the above sum into three sub-sums S_1, S_2, and S_3. S_1 will consist of the contribution from those primes $\xi_1 < p \leq B$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{\xi_1 < p \leq B} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \tau(p)} \frac{B^{n-1}}{(\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{v}^{(j)}; p^2))^{n-1}} \\ &\ll B^{n-1} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \tau(p)} \sum_{p \leq B} 1 \\ &\ll \frac{B^n}{\log B}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the trivial estimate that $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}, p^2) \geq 1$.

S_2 will be the sub-sum consisting of those $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}; p^2) \geq B(\log B)^{-1/3n}$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\ll_d \sum_{\xi_1 < p \leq B^n (\log B)^{2/3}} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \tau(p)} \frac{B^{n-1} (\log B)^{(n-1)/3n}}{B^{n-1}} \\ &\ll_d (\log B)^{\frac{(n-1)}{3n}} \frac{B^n (\log B)^{2/3}}{\log B} \\ &\ll_d B^n (\log B)^{-1/3n}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, S_3 will denote the sub-sum consisting of those primes $p > B$ and $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}, p^2) \leq B(\log B)^{-1/3n}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &\ll \sum_{0 < |x_1^{(1)}|, \cdots, |x_n^{(1)}| \leq B(\log B)^{-1/3n}} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \tau(p)} \sum_{\substack{p^2 | \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ p > B}} \frac{B^{n-1}}{(\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}; p^2))^{n-1}} \\ &\ll B^{n-1} \sum_{0 < |x_1^{(1)}| \leq B(\log B)^{-1/3n}} \frac{1}{|x_1^{(1)}|^{n-1}} \sum_{0 \leq |x_2^{(1)}|, \cdots, |x_n^{(1)}| \leq |x_1^{(1)}|} \sum_{\substack{p^2 | F(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ p > B}} 1 \\ &\ll B^{n-1} B (\log B)^{-1/3n}, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality following form the fact that at most $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1$ many primes with $p > B$ satisfy $p^2 | F(\mathbf{x}_1)$, since $\|\mathbf{x}_1\| \leq B$. □

4. The Ekedahl sieve

In this section, we use the following result of Ekedahl in [7] to handle certain contributions to $N_3(B)$. The version below was formulated by Bhargava and Shankar in [2]:

Proposition 4.1 (Ekedahl sieve)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a compact region in $\mathbb{R}^n$ having finite measure, and let Y be any closed subscheme of $\mathbb{A}^n_{\mathbb{Z}}$ of co-dimension $s \geq 2$. Let r and M be positive real numbers. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\{\mathbf{x} \in r\mathcal{B} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x} \pmod p \in Y(\mathbb{F}_p) \text{ for some prime } p > M\} \\ &\qquad = O\left(\frac{r^n}{M^{s-1} \log M} + r^{n-s+1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We factor F into linear factors over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, where

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \left(\psi_1^{(j)} x_1 + \cdots + \psi_n^{(j)} x_n \right) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} L_i(\mathbf{x}). \tag{4.1}$$

Let $Y_{i,j}$ denote the variety defined by $L_i(\mathbf{x}) = L_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Let p be a prime. Over $\mathbb{Z}_p$, we have the factorization (see [25]) of F into

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = F^*(\mathbf{x}) \prod_{i=1}^{\tau(p)} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $F^*, \mathcal{L}_i$ have $\mathbb{Z}_p$-coefficients and F^* does not have linear factors over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. Let $\mathcal{S}_p$ be those congruence classes $\mathbf{x}$ in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that either

(a) There exist $1 \le i < j \le \tau(p)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, or
(b) $F^*(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

Observe that if $\mathbf{a}$ satisfies (b), then there must exist two distinct linear factors $\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{L}_j$ of F^* for which $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{a}) \equiv \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, since $\mathbf{a}$ is invariant under any action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ but $\mathcal{L}_i$ is not invariant, since it does not have coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}_p$. It thus follows that whenever $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{S}_p$ that $\mathbf{a} \in Y_{i,j}(\mathbb{F}_p)$ for some indices $1 \le i < j \le d$. We then have the following consequence of Ekedahl's sieve:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $N_3^*(B)$ denote the number of elements $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap [-B, B]^n$ for which $\mathbf{x} \pmod{p} \in \mathcal{S}_p$ for some $p > \xi_1$. Then*

$$N_3^*(B) = O\left(\frac{B^n}{\xi_1 \log \xi_1} + B^{n-1} \right).$$

5. The Selberg sieve

In this section we use a variant of the Selberg sieve to give an upper bound for $N_3(B)$. Our main goal in this section is to establish the following proposition:

Proposition 5.1. *Let $N_3(B)$ be as given in (2.5). Then $N_3(B) = o(B^n)$.*

Proposition 5.1 will follow from Lemmas 5.4, 5.6, 5.7, 5.10, and 5.12 below as well as Lemma 4.2. Consider the set

$$\mathcal{N}_3^\dagger(B) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap [-B, B]^n \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} F(\mathbf{x}) = uq^k, u \text{ is indivisible by } p^k \text{ for } p \le \xi_1, \\ \text{indivisible by } p^2 \text{ for } \xi_1 < p \le \xi_2, \\ q \text{ is a prime exceeding } \xi_2, \mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{S}_p \text{ for all } p | u. \end{array} \right\}, \tag{5.1}$$

and note that $N_3^\dagger(B) = \#\mathcal{N}_3^\dagger(B)$. We shall establish the following preliminary result:

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_3^\dagger(B)$ and u, q be as in (5.1). Then we have*

$$u = O\left(B^2 (\log B)^{-2k/3} \right).$$

Furthermore, u can be written as $u = u_1 u_2$, where u_1 divides

$$C(\xi_1) = \prod_{p \le \xi_1} p^{k-1},$$

and u_2 is square-free with each prime divisor p of u_2 satisfying $\xi_1 < p \le \xi_2$.

Proof. Observe that from $F(\mathbf{x}) = uq^k$ and our assumptions on q, we have

$$u = O\left(B^d \xi_2^{-k}\right).$$

By (1.5) and (2.2), there exists an absolute positive constant C_1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} |u| &< C_1 B^{d-kn} (\log B)^{-2k/3} \\ &\leq C_1 B^{d-d+2} (\log B)^{-2k/3} \\ &= C_1 B^2 (\log B)^{-2k/3}. \end{aligned}$$

We now factor u into two factors u_1 and u_2, where u_1 consists of only prime factors less than ξ_1. We observe that since we have accounted for small prime powers via our treatment of $N_1(B)$, we have that u_1 divides $\prod_{p \leq \xi_1} p^{k-1} = C(\xi_1)$. The factor u_2, then, will be composed of prime factors larger than ξ_1. Further, it must be *square-free*. This is because, by definition, the prime factors of u between ξ_1 and ξ_2 divide u exactly once, and u cannot have a prime factor exceeding ξ_2, since otherwise

$$uq^k \gg B^{n(k+1)} \log B \gg B^d \log B,$$

which contradicts $|m_i| \leq B$. □

For each integer square-free integer u_2 such that each prime divisor p of u_2 satisfies $\xi_1 < p \leq \xi_2$, put

$$\mathcal{D}(u_2) = \prod_{\substack{\xi_1 < p \leq \frac{1}{12}\log(B^2 u_2^{-1}) \\ p \nmid u_2 \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{k}}} p. \tag{5.2}$$

We then have the following lemma:

Lemma 5.3. *Let u_2 be a square-free integer such that all of its prime divisors are between ξ_1 and ξ_2. Let $\omega(m)$ denote the number of distinct prime divisors of m. Let $\mathcal{D}(u_2)$ be as in (5.2). If $q > \xi_2$ is a prime, then there exists exactly $k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}$ residue classes $\{\mathfrak{d}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{d}_{k^{\omega(D)}}\}$ such that*

$$\mathfrak{d}_j^k \equiv q^k \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, k^{\omega(D)}$.

Proof. Since all prime divisors of $\mathcal{D}$ are $O(\log B)$, it follows that q^k is a proper k-th power residue modulo $\mathcal{D}$. Now consider the family of all k-th power residues modulo $\mathcal{D}$. By our choice of $\mathcal{D}$, we have that $k | \varphi(\mathcal{D})$, so that the family of k-th power residues is not the set of all residues modulo $\mathcal{D}$. For each $p | \mathcal{D}$, q^k has k pre-images modulo p, meaning there exist k distinct elements $\mathfrak{q}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{q}_k$ in $\{0, 1, \cdots, p-1\}$ such that $\mathfrak{q}_j^k \equiv q^k \pmod{\mathcal{Q}}$. For a positive integer l let us write $\omega(l)$ for the number of distinct prime divisors of l. Then it follows from the Chinese Remainder Theorem, that there exist $k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}$ residue classes $\{\mathfrak{d}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{d}_{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}}\}$ modulo $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathfrak{d}_j^k \equiv q^k \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$. □

Let C_1 be as in Lemma 5.2, and put $\xi_3 = C_1 B^2 (\log B)^{-2k/3}$. Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 have the following consequence, which is crucial for our estimation of $N_3(B)$:

Lemma 5.4. *Let u_1 be a divisor of $C(\xi_1)$, u_2 a square-free integer whose prime divisors p satisfy $\xi_1 < p \leq \xi_2$, and let q be a prime exceeding ξ_2. Let $H_{u_1,u_2}(B)$ be the number of solutions $(m_1, \cdots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap [-B, B]^n$ to the following three congruences:*

$$F(m_1, \cdots, m_n) \equiv 0 \pmod{u_1}, \tag{5.3}$$

$$F(m_1, \cdots, m_n) \equiv 0 \pmod{u_2}, \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$F(m_1, \cdots, m_n) \equiv q^k \pmod{\mathcal{D}} \tag{5.5}$$

such that $(m_1, \cdots, m_n) \pmod{p} \notin \mathcal{S}_p$ for $p | u_1 u_2$. Then we have

$$N_3(B) = \sum_{\substack{u_1 | C(\xi_1) \\ u_2 \leq \xi_3}} \frac{H_{u_1,u_2}(B)}{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}} + N_3^*(B). \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. (5.6) follows from the fact that the solutions to (5.5) can be partitioned into sets of cardinality $k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}$ by Lemma 5.3. □

In view of Lemma 4.2, we shall be primarily concerned with the term

$$N_3^\dagger(B) = \sum_{\substack{u_1 | C(\xi_1) \\ u_2 \leq \xi_3}} \frac{H_{u_1,u_2}(B)}{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}}.$$

5.1. **Selberg sieve weights.** We now introduce the relevant Selberg sieve weights. Selberg devised an ingenious method to establish an upper bound for counting integer points in a box. To state this precisely, suppose that we wanted to count the set of points inside the box $[-B, B]^n$ satisfying a set of congruence conditions $\mathcal{R}_l$ modulo a positive integer l. Selberg introduced smooth functions γ which satisfy the inequality

$$\sum_{\substack{(m_1,\cdots,m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap [-B,B]^n \\ (m_1,\cdots,m_n) \in \mathcal{R}_l}} 1 \leq \sum_{\substack{(m_1,\cdots,m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \\ (m_1,\cdots,m_n) \in \mathcal{R}_l}} \gamma(m_1) \cdots \gamma(m_n), \tag{5.7}$$

where γ is an upper bound for the characteristic function $\chi_B(z)$ of the interval $[-B, B]$, tends to zero rapidly outside of this interval, and is sufficiently smooth to be conducive to Fourier analysis and the Poisson summation formula. This reduces various counting problems into a question about exponential sums, from which one can draw results from a vast literature, including the seminal works of Weil and Deligne.

Our choice of γ is identical to that of Hooley's in [25]. Namely, we start with the function, first given by Beurling and later utilized by Selberg to establish the optimal general bound for the large sieve inequality:

$$\mathrm{Beu}(z) = \left(\frac{\sin \pi z}{\pi}\right)^2 \left(\sum_{n=0} \frac{1}{(z-n)^2} - \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} \frac{1}{(z-n)^2} + \frac{1}{2z}\right). \tag{5.8}$$

For the interval $[-U, U]$ we construct the function

$$g_U(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathrm{Beu}(U - z) + \mathrm{Beu}(U + z)\right)$$

which has the property that it is non-negative and majorizes the characteristic function of $[-U, U]$ (see [40]). Further, it satisfies the important property that its Fourier transform $\hat{g}_U(t)$ satisfies

$$\hat{g}_U(t) = \begin{cases} 2U+1 & \text{if } t = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } |t| > U \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$|\hat{g}_U(t)| \leq 2U + 1.$$

We now define the function γ as

$$\gamma(z) = g_1\left(\frac{z}{B}\right), \tag{5.10}$$

whence it follows that

$$\hat{\gamma}(t) = B\hat{g}_1(Bt).$$

It is clear that $\gamma(z) \geq \chi_B(z)$ for all real numbers z. Because of the smoothness of γ, we can evaluate the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{(m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n \\ (m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in\mathcal{R}_l}} \gamma(m_1)\cdots\gamma(m_n)$$

via Poisson summation. We have the following lemma:

Lemma 5.5. *Let l be a positive integer, and let $\mathcal{R}_l$ be a subset of $(\mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z})^n$. Let γ be as in (5.10), and put*

$$M_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B) = \sum_{\substack{(m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n \\ (m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in\mathcal{R}_l}} \gamma(m_1)\cdots\gamma(m_n).$$

Let

$$E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l) = \sum_{(a_1,\cdots,a_n)\in\mathcal{R}_l} e^{-2\pi i(a_1t_1+\cdots+a_nt_n)/l}. \tag{5.11}$$

Then

$$M_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B) = \frac{1}{l^n}\sum_{(t_1,\cdots,t_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{t_1}{l}\right)\cdots\hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{t_n}{l}\right) E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l). \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. Fix a congruence class $(a_1,\cdots,a_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z})^n$ and write $m_j = a_j + ls_j$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{(m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n \\ (m_1,\cdots,m_n)\equiv(a_1,\cdots,a_n) \pmod{l}}} \gamma(m_1)\cdots\gamma(m_n) = \sum_{(s_1,\cdots,s_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \gamma(a_1+ls_1)\cdots\gamma(a_n+ls_n). \tag{5.13}$$

Now, via Poisson summation, we obtain

$$\sum_{(s_1,\cdots,s_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \gamma(a_1+ls_1)\cdots\gamma(a_n+ls_n) = \tag{5.14}$$

$$\sum_{(t_1,\cdots,t_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma(a_1+u_1l)\cdots\gamma(a_n+u_nl)e^{2\pi i(t_1u_1+\cdots+t_nu_n)}du_1\cdots du_n.$$

Making the substitution $v_j = a_j + u_j l$, we see that the right hand side of (5.14) is equal to

(5.15)
$$\frac{1}{l^n} \sum_{(t_1,\cdots,t_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} e^{-2\pi i(a_1t_1+\cdots+a_nt_n)/l} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma(v_1)\cdots\gamma(v_n)e^{2\pi i(t_1v_1+\cdots+t_nv_n)/l}dv_1\cdots dv_n.$$

By recalling the definition of Fourier transform, we obtain that (5.15) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{l^n} \sum_{(t_1,\cdots,t_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} e^{-2\pi i(a_1t_1+\cdots+a_nt_n)/l} \hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{t_1}{l}\right)\cdots\hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{t_n}{l}\right).$$

Now, if we sum over the congruence classes in $\mathcal{R}_l$ we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{(m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n\\(m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in\mathcal{R}_l}} \gamma(m_1)\cdots\gamma(m_n) = \frac{1}{l^n} \sum_{(t_1,\cdots,t_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{t_1}{l}\right)\cdots\hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{t_n}{l}\right) \sum_{(a_1,\cdots,a_n)\in\mathcal{R}_l} e^{-2\pi i(a_1t_1+\cdots+a_nt_n)/l}.$$

□

We shall decompose $M_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B)$ into two terms, given by

$$M_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B) = M^{+}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B) + O\left(M^{++}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B)\right), \tag{5.16}$$

where

$$M^{+}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B) = \frac{1}{l^n}\left(\hat{\gamma}(0)\right)^n E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(0,\cdots,0;l) = \frac{(3B)^n \#\mathcal{R}_l}{l^n}$$

and

$$M^{++}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B) = \frac{B^n}{l^n} \sum_{|t_i|\le l/B}{}' |E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l)|,$$

where the symbol $\sum'$ denotes that the tuple $(0,\cdots,0)$ had been omitted. We then have the following:

Lemma 5.6. *Let $l = u_1u_2\mathcal{D}$, where $u_1, u_2, \mathcal{D}$ are as in Lemma 5.4. Put $l = u_1u_2\mathcal{D}$, and let $\mathcal{R}_l = \mathcal{R}_{u_1u_2\mathcal{D}}$ denote the set of congruence classes modulo l satisfying (5.3), (5.4), and (5.5). Then*

$$N_3(B) \le \sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_1)\\u_2\le\xi_3}} \frac{M^{+}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B)}{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}} + O\left(\sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_1)\\u_2\le\xi_3}} \frac{M^{++}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B)}{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}}\right).$$

Proof. This follows from (5.6), (5.7) and (5.16). □

We put

$$N_4(B) = \sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_1)\\u_2\le\xi_3}} \frac{M^{+}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B)}{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}}. \tag{5.17}$$

For a real number α and a positive integer m put

$$\sigma_\alpha(m) = \sum_{d|m} d^\alpha.$$

Our next lemma gives us an estimate for $N_4(B)$:

Lemma 5.7. *Let $u_1, u_2, \mathcal{D}, l, \mathcal{R}_l$ be as in Lemma 5.6 and $N_4(B)$ as in (5.17). Then*

$$N_4(B) = O\left(\frac{B^n}{(\log B)^{C_4/\log\log\log B}}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R}_{u_1}, \mathcal{R}_{u_2}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ denote respectively the congruence classes corresponding to (5.3), (5.4) and (5.5), respectively. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem it follows that

$$\#\mathcal{R}_l = \#\mathcal{R}_{u_1}\#\mathcal{R}_{u_2}\#\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}.$$

For $\mathcal{R}_{u_1}$, we use the trivial bound $\#\mathcal{R}_{u_1} = O(u_1^n)$. For $\mathcal{R}_{u_2}$, we note that for each prime p dividing u_2 there are $O(p^{n-1})$ solutions in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ to (5.4), whence $\#\mathcal{R}_{u_2} = O(u_2^{n-1})$ since u_2 is square-free. Note that $\gcd(u_1u_2, \mathcal{D}) = 1$. By the theorem of Lang and Weil [28], which states that the number of points over $\mathbb{F}_p$, for a prime $p|\mathcal{D}$, on the variety defined by the congruence

$$F(x_1, \cdots, x_n) - u_1u_2q^k \equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

is

$$p^n + O(p^{n-1/2}).$$

Then

$$\#\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}} = \prod_{p|\mathcal{D}} \left(p^n + O\left(p^{n-1/2}\right)\right), \tag{5.18}$$

whence

$$\#\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{D}^n \prod_{p|\mathcal{D}} \left(1 + O\left(p^{-1/2}\right)\right) = O(\mathcal{D}^n\sigma_{-1/4}(\mathcal{D})).$$

Thus, by (5.16), (5.18), and Lemma 2.1 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} N_4(B) &= O_{\xi_1}\left(\sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_1)\\ u_2\le\xi_3}} \frac{(3B)^n\sigma_0(u_2)u_2^{n-1}\sigma_{-1/4}(u_2)\mathcal{D}^n\sigma_{-1/4}(\mathcal{D})}{(u_2\mathcal{D})^n k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}}\right) \\ &= O_{\xi_1}\left(\sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_1)\\ u_2\le\xi_3}} \frac{B^n\sigma_0(u_2)\sigma_{-1/4}(u_2)\sigma_{-1/4}(\mathcal{D})}{u_2k^{\omega(D)}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{-1/4}(\mathcal{D}) &= \prod_{p|\mathcal{D}}(1 + p^{-1/4}) \\ &= O\left(\left(\frac{2k}{3}\right)^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}\right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$N_4(B) = O_{\xi_1}\left(\sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_1)\\ u_2\le\xi_3}} \frac{B^n\sigma_0(u_2)\sigma_{-1/4}(u_2)}{u_2(3/2)^{\omega(D)}}\right),$$

Let us write

$$\xi_4 = \xi_4(u_2) = \frac{1}{12}\log(B^2 u_2^{-1}),$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D}'(u_2) = \prod_{\mathcal{Q}\leq \xi_4} \mathcal{Q}.$$

Observe that as $B^2\xi_3^{-1} \to \infty$ as B tends to infinity, we have

$$\log \mathcal{D}' = \sum_{\mathcal{Q}\leq \xi_4} \log \mathcal{Q} < \frac{12}{11}\xi_4$$

for B sufficiently large. From (5.2), we see that

$$\mathcal{D} \leq \mathcal{D}' < \exp\left(12\xi_4/11\right) = \left(\frac{B^2}{u_2}\right)^{1/11}.$$

Next, we have

$$\omega(\mathcal{D}') = \pi(\xi_4; k, 1) \sim \frac{\xi_4}{\varphi(k)\log \xi_4},$$

where $\pi(B; q, a)$ is the counting function of primes p satisfying $p \equiv a \pmod q$ up to B, and the above asymptotic follows from Dirichlet's theorem on primes in arithmetic progressions. Therefore we may find a constant C_2 such that

$$\omega(\mathcal{D}') > \frac{C_2\xi_4}{\log \xi_4}$$

for all B sufficiently large. Observe that for a square-free number l, we have

$$\sigma_0(l) = \prod_{p|l}(1+1) = 2^{\omega(l)}.$$

From the definition of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, it follows that

$$(3/2)^{\omega(\mathcal{D}')} < (3/2)^{\omega(D')}C(\xi_0)(3/2)^{\gcd(\mathcal{D}', u_2)} < (3/2)^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}C(\xi_0)\sigma_0(\gcd(\mathcal{D}', u_2).$$

Hence, there exists a positive number C_3, which depends on ξ_0, such that

$$\frac{1}{(3/2)^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}} < \frac{C_3}{(3/2)^{\omega(\mathcal{D}')}}\sigma_0(\gcd(\mathcal{D}', u_2)). \tag{5.19}$$

From here we obtain the estimate

$$N_4(B) = O\left(\sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_0)\\ u_2\leq \xi_3}} \frac{B^n\sigma_0(u_2)\sigma_{-1/4}(u_2)\sigma_0(\gcd(\mathcal{D}', u_2))}{(3/2)^{\omega(\mathcal{D}')}u_2}\right).$$

We now invoke Lemma 6.2 in [25] to see that, for some positive number C_4, that

$$N_4(B) = O\left(\frac{B^n}{(\log B)^{C_4/\log\log\log B}}\right),$$

as desired. □

Next we turn our attention to the much more difficult component

$$N_5(B) = \sum_{\substack{u_1 | C(\xi_1) \\ u_2 \leq \xi_3}} \frac{M^{++}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(B)}{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}}. \tag{5.20}$$

Recall from (5.11) that

$$E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(t_1, \cdots, t_n; l) = E_{\mathcal{R}_{u_1}} E_{\mathcal{R}_{u_2}} E_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}}.$$

The term $E_{\mathcal{R}_{u_1}}(t_1, \cdots, t_n; u_1)$ depends only on ξ_1 and is thus independent of B. We now consider the term $E_{\mathcal{R}_{u_2}}$. For each prime p dividing u_2 we write

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = F^*(\mathbf{x}) \prod_{j=1}^{\tau(p)} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{x}),$$

where F^* and $\mathcal{L}_i$ have coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. We then write $E_{\mathcal{R}_{u_2}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathcal{R}_{u_2}}(t_1, \cdots, t_n; u_2) &= \prod_{p | u_2} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \tau(p)} \sum_{\substack{(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \\ \mathcal{L}_i(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \equiv 0 \pmod p}} e^{2\pi i (a_1 t_1 + \cdots + a_n t_n)/p} \right) \\ &= \prod_{p | u_2} S(t_1, \cdots, t_n; p). \end{aligned}$$

We shall obtain the following estimate for $S(t_1, \cdots, t_n; p)$:

Lemma 5.8. *Let p be a prime, and put*

$$S(t_1, \cdots, t_n; p) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \tau(p)} \sum_{\substack{(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \\ \mathcal{L}_i(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \equiv 0 \pmod p}} e^{2\pi i (a_1 t_1 + \cdots + a_n t_n)/p}.$$

Then we have

$$S(t_1, \cdots, t_n; p) \begin{cases} \leq \tau(p) p^{n-1}, & \text{if } t_1 x_1 + \cdots + t_n x_n \text{ divides } F(\mathbf{x}) \text{ over } \mathbb{F}_p, \\ = 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.21}$$

Proof. We consider two scenarios. Suppose that

$$\mathcal{L}_s(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = \upsilon_1^{(s)} x_1 + \cdots + \upsilon_n^{(s)} x_n, \upsilon_j^{(s)} \in \mathbb{Z}_p \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

If $(t_1, \cdots, t_n) \equiv \lambda(\upsilon_1^{(s)}, \upsilon_2^{(s)}, \cdots, \upsilon_n^{(s)}) \pmod p$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$, then

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \\ \mathcal{L}_s(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \equiv 0 \pmod p}} e^{2\pi i (a_1 t_1 + \cdots + a_n t_n)/p} = p^{n-1}.$$

Observe that since $p \nmid \Delta(F)$, that there does not exist $1 \leq s \leq \tau(p)$ such that $p | \upsilon_j^{(s)}$ for all $j = 1, \cdots, n$. We may suppose, without loss of generality, that $\upsilon_1^{(s)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$. Suppose that $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is such that

$$\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod p.$$

It then follows that

$$a_1 \equiv -\left(v_1^{(s)}\right)^{-1}\left(v_2^{(s)}a_2 + \cdots + v_n^{(s)}a_n\right).$$

This implies

(5.22)
$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,\cdots,a_n)\in\mathbb{F}_p^n \\ \mathcal{L}_s(a_1,\cdots,a_n)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} e^{2\pi i(a_1t_1+\cdots+a_nt_n)/p} = \sum_{(a_2,\cdots,a_n)\in\mathbb{F}_p^n} e^{2\pi i(a_2(t_2-t_1(v_1^{(s)})^{-1}v_2^{(s)})+\cdots+a_n(t_n-t_1(v_1^{(s)})^{-1}v_n^{(s)}))/p}.$$

The right hand side can be written as

$$\prod_{j=2}^{n}\sum_{a\in\mathbb{F}_p} e^{2\pi i a_j(v_1^{(s)}t_j - t_1v_j^{(s)})/p}.$$

For each j, the sum

$$\sum_{a\in\mathbb{F}_p} e^{2\pi i a_j(v_1^{(s)}t_j - t_1v_j^{(s)})/p}$$

is zero unless the exponent is identically zero. This shows that (5.22) is non-zero if and only if $v_1^{(s)}t_j \equiv t_1v_j^{(s)} \pmod p$ for $j = 2, \cdots, n$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}(t_1,\cdots,t_n) &\equiv t_1(v_1^{(s)})^{-1}(v_1^{(s)}, v_1^{(s)}t_2t_1^{-1}, \cdots, v_1^{(s)}t_nt_1^{-1}) \pmod p \\ &\equiv t_1(v_1^{(s)})^{-1}(v_1^{(s)}, v_2^{(s)}, \cdots, v_n^{(j)}) \pmod p,\end{aligned}$$

hence the first situation is the only case where the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,\cdots,a_n)\in\mathbb{F}_p^n \\ \mathcal{L}_s(a_1,\cdots,a_n)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} e^{2\pi i(a_1t_1+\cdots+a_nt_n)/p}$$

is non-zero. In other words, we have

$$S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;p)\begin{cases}\leq \tau(p)p^{n-1}, & \text{if } t_1x_1+\cdots+t_nx_n \text{ divides } F(\mathbf{x}) \text{ over } \mathbb{F}_p, \\ = 0, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

as desired. □

For square-free l, let us write

$$S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l) = \prod_{p|l} S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;p).$$

We have the following lemma:

Lemma 5.9. *Let $u_1, u_2, \mathcal{D}$ be as in Lemma 5.6. Then*

(5.23)
$$\sum_{\substack{u_1|C(\xi_1) \\ u_2\leq\xi_3}} \frac{M_l^{++}(B)}{k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}} = O\left(\sum_{u_2\leq\xi_3}\frac{B^n}{u_2^n}\sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n|\leq u_2/B}{}' S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2)\right)$$

Proof. Recall that

$$M_l^{++}(B) = \frac{B^n}{u_1^n u_2^n \mathcal{D}^n} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_i|\le l/B} |E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l)|.$$

Note that

$$|E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(t_1,\cdots,t_n;\mathcal{D})| = O\left(\mathcal{D}^n \sigma_{-1/4}(\mathcal{D})\right),$$

and the multiplicativity of $E_{\mathcal{R}_l}$ implies that

$$|E_{\mathcal{R}_l}(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l)| = O\left(\mathcal{D}^n \sigma_{-1/4}(\mathcal{D}) S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2)\right).$$

Next note that

$$\sigma_{-1/4}(\mathcal{D}) = O\left(k^{\omega(\mathcal{D})}\right)$$

since $k \ge 2$. This then implies (5.23). □

We now assess $S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2)$ for an n-tuple $(t_1,\cdots,t_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. By Lemma 5.8, this is zero unless for each prime $p|u_2$ there exists $\lambda_p \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and $1 \le s_p \le \tau(p)$ such that $(t_1,\cdots,t_n) \equiv \lambda_p(\upsilon_1^{(s_p)}, \upsilon_2^{(s_p)},\cdots,\upsilon_n^{(s_p)}) \pmod p$. One checks at once that for a fixed vector $\boldsymbol{\upsilon} = (\upsilon_1,\cdots,\upsilon_n)$, the set

$$\{(x_1,\cdots,x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n : (x_1,\cdots,x_n) \equiv \lambda(\upsilon_1,\cdots,\upsilon_n) \pmod p \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p\}$$

is a lattice. For each prime p dividing u_2, there are $\tau(p) \le d$ such lattices to consider. If $(t_1,\cdots,t_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is such that $S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2)$ is non-zero, then it must lie on one such lattice for each prime divisor of u_2. Therefore, $(t_1,\cdots,t_n)$ lies on one of at most $d^{\omega(u_2)}$ lattices, each with determinant u_2. Let $\mathfrak{L}(u_2)$ denote the set of lattices for which the n-tuples $(t_1,\cdots,t_n)$ such that $S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2) \ne 0$ are restricted to.

Put

$$Q(B) = \sum_{u_2 \le \xi_3} \frac{1}{u_2^n} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n| \le u_2/B} S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2). \tag{5.24}$$

Let us assess $Q(B)$ by restricting the range of u_2 to a dyadic interval of the form $(U/2,U]$, with $U \le \xi_3$. Denote this contribution to $Q(B)$ by $Q_U(B)$. We have the following lemma:

Lemma 5.10. *Let $Q(B)$ be as in (5.24). Then there exists a positive number C_5 such that for all $U > 1$, we have*

$$Q_U(B) = O\left(\frac{U(\log B)^{C_5}}{B^2}\right).$$

Proof. Let us write $F_s(x_1,x_s)$ for the product

$$F_s(x_1,x_s) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} (\psi_1^{(j)} x_1 + \psi_s^{(j)} x_s),$$

where $\psi_s^{(j)}$ are as in (4.1). If we fix a vector $(t_1,\cdots,t_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, then there are only at $\sigma_0(F_2(t_2,-t_1))$ many u_2 such that $(t_1,\cdots,t_n) \in \Lambda$ for some $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{L}(u_2)$. To see this, if $(t_1,\cdots,t_n) \in \Lambda$ for $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{L}(u_2)$, then for each prime $p|u_2$, we have $(t_1,\cdots,t_n) \equiv$

$\lambda_p(1, v_2^{(s)}, \cdots, v_n^{(s)}) \pmod p$ for some $\lambda_p \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and $1 \leq s \leq \tau(p)$. Then it follows that $t_2 \equiv t_1 v_2^{(s)} \pmod p$, hence it follows that

$$F_2(t_2, -t_1) \equiv 0 \pmod p.$$

This implies that $u_2 | F_2(t_2, -t_1)$, as claimed. Further, by the same argument we get that $u_2 | F_s(t_s, -t_1)$ for all $2 \leq s \leq n$.

Now we can estimate $Q_U(B)$ when U is suitably small as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_U(B) &\leq \frac{2^n}{U^n} \sum_{U/2 < u_2 \leq U} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|, \cdots, |t_n| \leq U/B} S(t_1, \cdots, t_n; u_2) \\ &\leq \frac{2^n}{U} \sum_{U/2 < u_2 \leq U} d^{\omega(u_2)} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{\substack{|t_1|, \cdots, |t_n| \leq U/B \\ u_2 | \gcd(F_2(t_2, -t_1), \cdots, F_n(t_n, -t_1))}} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that when t_1, t_2 are fixed, then for each $t_j, j = 3, \cdots, n$, there are at most $d^{\omega(u_2)}$ congruence classes modulo u_2 for which t_j may lie in, and for each congruence class, at most $(2UB^{-1})/u_2 + 1$ choices for integers in the range $[-U/B, U/B]$. Since $U/2 < u_2 \leq U$, there is at most one choice when B is sufficiently large. By the binomial theorem, for a number A and a square-free positive integer m, we have

$$\sum_{r | m} A^{\omega(r)} = (A+1)^{\omega(m)}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} Q_U(B) &\leq \frac{2^n}{U} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|, |t_2| \leq U/B} \sum_{u_2 | F_2(t_2, -t_1)} d^{(n-1)\omega(u_2)} \\ &= \frac{2^n}{U} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|, |t_2| \leq U/B} (d^{n-1} + 1)^{\omega(F_2(t_2, -t_1))}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

so by Lemma 10.1 in [25], there exists a positive number C_5 such that

$$Q_U(B) = O\left(\frac{U(\log B)^{C_5}}{B^2} \right).$$

□

If U is relatively small, say $U = O\left(B^2 (\log B)^{-C_5 - 1}\right)$, then this is a satisfactory bound. Otherwise, we use Lemma 10.2 in [25], which we state as

Lemma 5.11. *(Hooley, 2009) Set* $\Xi(B) = B^{\frac{1}{6(\log \log B)^2}}$. *Fix* $u_2 \leq \xi_3$. *Let* $\omega^\dagger(m)$ *denote the number of distinct prime factors of* m *that exceed* Ξ *and let*

$$l^* = \prod_{\substack{p \leq \Xi \\ p | u_2}} p$$

and

$$l^\dagger = \prod_{\substack{p > \Xi \\ p | u_2}} p.$$

Suppose that $l^* \leq B^{1/6}$. Then, for any positive constant C_6 and for $B^{1/2} < Y < B$, there exists a positive number C_7, depending only on C_6, such that

$$\sum_{\substack{(u_1,u_2)\equiv(t_1,t_2) \pmod{l^*} \\ |u_1|,|u_2|\leq Y}}{}' C_6^{\omega^\dagger(F(u_1,u_2))} = O\left(\frac{Y^2(\log\log B)^{C_7}}{(l^*)^2}\right).$$

When $U \gg B^2(\log B)^{-C_5-1}$ we employ the divisors $l^*, l^\dagger$ of u_2 as in Lemma 5.11. Suppose firstly that $l^* > B^{1/6}$. This means that

$$B^{1/6} < \Xi^{\omega(l^*)} \leq \Xi^{\omega(u_2)},$$

which shows that

$$\omega(u_2) > (\log\log B)^2.$$

Hence, either $\omega(u_2) > (\log\log B)^2$ or $l^* \leq B^{1/6}$. Put

$$Q_U^{(1)}(B) = \sum_{\substack{U/2<u_2\leq U \\ \omega(u_2)>(\log\log B)^2}} \frac{1}{u_2^n} \sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n|\leq u_2/B}{}' S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2) \tag{5.26}$$

and

$$Q_U^{(2)}(B) = \sum_{\substack{U/2<u_2\leq U \\ l^*\leq B^{1/6}}} \frac{1}{u_2^n} \sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n|\leq u_2/B}{}' S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;u_2). \tag{5.27}$$

We have the following estimates for $Q_U^{(1)}(B)$ and $Q_U^{(2)}(B)$:

Lemma 5.12. *Let $Q_U^{(1)}(B), Q_U^{(2)}(B)$ be as in (5.26) and (5.27) respectively. We have the estimates*

$$Q_U^{(1)}(B) = O\left((\log B)^{-\log\log B}\right)$$

and

$$Q_U^{(2)}(B) = O\left((\log B)^{-1/3}\right).$$

To estimate $Q_U^{(1)}(B)$, we have by (5.25)

$$\begin{aligned} Q_U^{(1)}(B) &\leq \frac{2^n}{U} \sum_{\substack{u_2\leq U \\ \omega(u_2)>(\log\log B)^2}} \sum_{|t_1|,|t_2|\leq u_2/B}{}' d^{(n-1)\omega(F(t_2,-t_1))} \\ &\ll_n \frac{1}{U} \sum_{|t_1|,|t_2|\leq U/B}{}' \sum_{\substack{u_2|F_2(t_2,-t_1) \\ \omega(u_2)>(\log\log B)^2}} d^{(n-1)\omega(u_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that since $u_2|F_2(t_2,-t_1)$, we have

$$d^{(n-1)\omega(u_2)} = \frac{d^{(n-1)\omega(u_2)}e^{(\log\log B)^2}}{(\log B)^{\log\log B}} < \frac{(3d^{n-1})^{\omega(u_2)}}{(\log B)^{\log\log B}}.$$

By the binomial theorem and the fact that u_2 is square-free, it follows that

$$\sum_{\substack{u_2|F_2(t_2,-t_1) \\ \omega(u_2)>(\log\log B)^2}} d^{(n-1)\omega(u_2)} \leq \sum_{\substack{u_2|F_2(t_2,-t_1) \\ \omega(u_2)>(\log\log B)^2}} \frac{(3d^{n-1})^{\omega(u_2)}}{(\log B)^{\log\log B}} = \frac{(3d^{n-1}+1)^{\omega(F_2(t_2,-t_1))}}{(\log B)^{\log\log B}}.$$

Hence, we see that for some positive C_6

$$Q_U^{(1)}(B) \ll_n \frac{1}{U(\log B)^{\log\log B}} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|,|t_2|\le U/B} (3d^{n-1}+1)^{\omega(F_2(t_2,-t_1))} \tag{5.28}$$
$$= O\left(\frac{U(\log\log B)^{C_6}}{B^2(\log B)^{\log\log B}}\right)$$
$$= O\left((\log B)^{-\log\log B}\right),$$

by Lemma 10.1 in [25] again.

The sum $Q_U^{(2)}(B)$ is more difficult. The key tool will be Lemma 5.11. Recall that $Q_U^{(2)}(B)$ consists of the contribution from those tuples for which $l^* \le B^{1/6}$ and $U > B^{2-\eta}$. By the multiplicativity of $S(t_1,\cdots,t_n,\cdot)$, it follows that

(5.29)

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_U^{(2)}(B) &\le \frac{2^n}{U^n} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n|\le U/B} \sum_{\substack{l^*l^\dagger \le U \\ l^* \le B^{1/6}}} S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l^*)S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l^\dagger) \\
&\le \frac{2^n}{U^n} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n|\le U/B} \sum_{\substack{l^*l^\dagger \le U \\ l^* \le B^{1/6} \\ l^\dagger | F_2(t_2,-t_1)}} d^{\omega(l^\dagger)}(l^\dagger)^{n-1} S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l^*) \\
&\le \frac{2^n}{U} \sum_{l^* \le B^{1/6}} \frac{1}{(l^*)^{n-1}} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n|\le U/B} S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l^*) \sum_{l^\dagger | F_2(t_2,-t_1)} d^{\omega(l^\dagger)} \\
&\ll \frac{2^n}{U} \sum_{l^* \le B^{1/6}} \frac{1}{(l^*)^{n-1}} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|t_1|,\cdots,|t_n|\le U/B} S(t_1,\cdots,t_n;l^*)(d^{n-1}+1)^{\omega^\dagger(F_2(t_2,-t_1))} \\
&\ll \frac{2^n}{U} \sum_{l^* \le B^{1/6}} \frac{1}{(l^*)^{n-1}} \sum_{0<b_1,\cdots,b_n\le l^*} S(b_1,\cdots,b_n;l^*) \sideset{}{'}\sum_{\substack{|t_1|,|t_2|\le U/B \\ t_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{l^*} \\ t_2 \equiv b_2 \pmod{l^*}}} (d^{n-1}+1)^{\omega^\dagger(F_2(t_2,-t_1))},
\end{aligned}$$

the innermost sum being treatable by Lemma 5.11 because $U < \xi_3 = C_1 B^2 (\log B)^{-2k/3}$, whence $U/B < B$. Hence, we see that

$$Q_U^{(2)}(B) = O_d\left(\frac{U(\log\log B)^{C_7}}{B^2} \sum_{l^* \le B^{1/6}} \frac{1}{(l^*)^{n+1}} \sum_{0<b_1,\cdots,b_n\le l^*} S(b_1,\cdots,b_n;l^*)\right).$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_U^{(2)}(B) &= O_d\left(\frac{U(\log\log B)^{C_7}}{B^2}\sum_{l^*\le B^{1/6}}\frac{\tau(l^*)}{l^*}\right) \\ &= O_d\left(\frac{U(\log\log B)^{C_7}}{B^2}\prod_{p\le B^{1/6}}\left(1+\frac{\tau(p)}{p}\right)\right) \\ &= O_d\left(\frac{U\log B(\log\log B)^{C_7}}{B^2}\right) \\ &= O_d\left((\log B)^{-(2k-3)/3}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 6.1 in [25].

References

[1] M. Bhargava, *The geometric sieve and the density of squarefree values of invariant polynomials*, arXiv, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.0031`, retrieved 08 Jul 2014.

[2] M. Bhargava, A. Shankar, *Binary quartic forms having bounded invariants, and the boundedness of the average rank of elliptic curves*, Annals of Mathematics **181** (2015), 191-242.

[3] M. Bhargava, A. Shankar, X. Wang, *Squarefree values of polynomial discriminants I*, arXiv:1611.09806 [math.NT] `https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.09806`

[4] T. D. Browning, *Quantitative Arithmetic on Projective Varieties*, Birkhauser, 2009.

[5] T. D. Browning, *Power-free values of polynomials*, Arch. Math. (2) **96** (2011), 139-150.

[6] D. Cox, J. Little, D. O'Shea, *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms - An Introduction to Computational Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[7] T. Ekedahl, *An infinite version of the Chinese remainder theorem*, Comment. Math. Univ. St. Paul. **40** (1991), 53-59.

[8] P. Erdős, *Arithmetical properties of polynomials*, J. London Math. Soc. **28** (1953), 416-425.

[9] P. Erdős, K. Mahler, *On the number of integers which can be represented by a binary form*, J. London Math. Soc. **13** (1938), 134-139.

[10] T. Estermann, *Einige Satze uber quadratfeie Zahlen*, Math. Ann., **105** (1931), 653-662.

[11] J-H. Evertse, *The number of solutions of decomposable form equations*, Inventiones Mathematicae **122** (1995), 559-601.

[12] M. Filaseta, *Powerfree values of binary forms*, Journal of Number Theory **49** (1994), 250-268.

[13] F. Gouvea, B. Mazur, *The square-free sieve and the rank of elliptic curves*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society, **4** (1991), 1-23.

[14] A. Granville, *ABC allows us to count squarefrees*, International Mathematics Research Notices, **9** (1998).

[15] G. Greaves, *Power-free values of binary forms*, Q. J. Math, (2) **43** (1992), 45-65.

[16] G.H. Hardy, E. M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, 5th edition, Oxford University Press, London and New York, 1979.

[17] H. Halberstam, K. F. Roth, *On the gaps between consecutive k-free integers*, J. London Math. Soc., (2) **26** (1951), 268-273.

[18] D. R. Heath-Brown, *Diophantine approximation with square free numbers*, Math. Z., **187** (1984), 335-344.

[19] D. R. Heath-Brown, *The density of rational points on curves and surfaces*, The Annals of Mathematics (2) **155** (2002), 553-598.

[20] D. R. Heath-Brown, *Counting rational points on algebraic varieties*, Analytic number theory, 5195, Lecture Notes in Math., 1891, Springer, Berlin, 2006.

[21] D. R. Heath-Brown, *Powerfree values of polynomials*, Q. J. Math, (2) **64** (2013), 177-188.

[22] H. A. Helfgott, *Power-free values, large deviations, and integer points on irrational curves*, Journal de Theorie des Nombres de Bordeaux, **19** (2007), 433-472.

[23] H. A. Helfgott, *Square-free values of $f(p)$, f cubic*, Acta Math., **213** (2014), 107-135.

[24] C. Hooley, *On the power free values of polynomials*, Mathematika **14** (1967), 21-26.

[25] C. Hooley, *On the power-free values of polynomials in two variables*, Roth 80th birthday volume, in press.

[26] C. Hooley, *On the power-free values of polynomials in two variables II*, Journal of Number Theory, **129** (2009), 1443-1455.

[27] M. N. Huxley, M. Nair, *Power free values of polynomials III*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **41** (1980), 66-82.

[28] S. Lang, A. Weil, *Number of points of varieties over finite fields*, American Journal of Mathematics, (4) **76** (1954), 819-827.

[29] J. Maynard, *Primes represented by incomplete norm forms*, arXiv:1507.05080 [math.NT], `http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.05080`.

[30] M. Nair, *Power free values of polynomials*, Mathematika, **23** (1976), 159-183.

[31] M. Nair, *Power free values of polynomials II*, Proc. London. Math. Soc. (3) **38** (1979), 353-368.

[32] B. Poonen, *Squarefree values of multivariate polynomials*, Duke Math. J., (2) **118** (2003), 353-373.
[33] T. Reuss, *Power-free values of polynomials*, preprint.
[34] G. Ricci, *Riecenche aritmetiche sui polynomials*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **57** (1933), 433-475.
[35] J. B. Rosser, L. Schoenfeld, *Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers*, Illinois J. Math., (1) **6** (1962), 64-94.
[36] W. M. Schmidt, *The number of solutions of norm form equations*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, (1) **317** (1990), 197-227.
[37] C. L. Stewart, *On the number of solutions of polynomial congruences and Thue equations*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society, (4) **4** (1991), 793-835.
[38] C. L. Stewart, J. Top, *On the ranks of twists of elliptic curves and power-free values of binary forms*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society, (4) **8** (1995), 943-973.
[39] A. Thue, *Uber Annaherungswerte algebraischer Zahlen*, Journal fur die reine und angewandte Mathematik, **135** (1909), 284-305.
[40] J. D. Vaaler, *Some extremal functions in Fourier analysis*, Bulletin of the AMS, (2) **12** (1985), 183-216.
[41] S. Y. Xiao, *Power-free values of binary forms and the global determinant method*, Int Math Res Notices (2016) doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnw165, First published online: July 27, 2016.

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK